

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 20 and 24 are currently being amended. This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-27 are now pending in this application.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lichtfuss (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0180709 A1). The Examiner asserts that Lichtfuss discloses that the expandable display is foldable because it can be wrapped around the housing (112) in a way that the display (110) is exposed to a viewer to view the image. To this assertion, Applicants disagree. Applicants have claimed in independent Claim 18 an expandable display for a handheld computer that is expandable through its foldability. Applicants respectfully submit that Lichtfuss does not disclose, teach, or suggest a display that is foldable. What is disclosed in Lichtfuss is that the display is flexible. That is, it can be deflected from a planar orientation to a deflected orientation without being rendered inoperable. Nowhere in Lichtfuss is it disclosed how to build such a display. Applicants have included in their disclosure description of foldable displays in which there may be multiple sections of the display and the sections may be, but are not necessarily, hinged. In fact, Applicants refer the Examiner to FIG. 2 of Lichtfuss in which it is shown what is intended by the word flexible or deflection where the display has been deflected a distant D for a given length L. In contrast, what Applicants claim in independent Claim 18 is foldable. The definition for foldable is to bend or close over upon itself. See, e.g., Oxford Illustrated Dictionary, New York, 1998, p. 314. Nowhere, does Lichtfuss disclose, teach, or suggest that the viewing device be

folded over upon itself, and in fact, generally teaches away from it being foldable because what is taught in Lichtfuss is flexible, that is the capacity to flex or deflect at least one centimeter as described in this paragraph. See, e.g., Lichtfuss, par. [0015]. Accordingly, Lichtfuss does not disclose, teach, or suggest all the claim limitations of independent Claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 18 and its dependent claims are therefore allowable.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Katsura, (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,324). In the rejection, the Examiner indicates that the claim “viewing an image on an unenlarged viewing area” is so broad that it can read on a user viewing only the image on the housing (1) if the housing (2) is in bending position 45-60 degrees to a housing (1). Applicants have amended independent Claim 24 to recite that “viewing an image on an unenlarged viewing area of a flexible display when the flexible display is folded, and enlarging the flexible display, by unfolding, to provide an enlarged viewing area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Katsura does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display be viewable when it is folded, only possibly that when it is bent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 24 is not anticipated by Katsura. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 24 and its respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Independent Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodony et al. in view of Lichtfuss. Applicants have amended independent Claims 7 and 13 with similar limitation to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the comments above regarding the limitation not appearing in Bodony as well as the limitation recited in independent Claims 7 and 13 are not found in Lichtfuss. Accordingly, Claims 7 and 13 and their dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 03, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603